



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,882	10/23/2003	Robert M. Japp	END920000150US2	8999
30449	7590	08/23/2005	EXAMINER	
SCHMEISER, OLSEN + WATTS			NORDMEYER, PATRICIA L	
3 LEAR JET LANE			ART UNIT	
SUITE 201			PAPER NUMBER	
LATHAM, NY 12110			1772	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/691,882	Applicant(s) JAPP ET AL.	
	Examiner Patricia L. Nordmeyer	Art Unit 1772	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/29/05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-13, 17 and 32-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-13, 17 and 32-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 29, 2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2 – 5, 10, 17, 32, 33, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatch et al. (USPN 4,929,370) in view of Weinreich (USPN 5,435,671).

Hatch et al. teach a structure comprising a stack comprising a plurality of sheets such that each successive sheet is coupled with a removable adhesive between each sheet and in direct mechanical contact with the successive sheets in each pair, and an opening extends through the plurality of sheets within the stack. The sheets may be selected from copper (Col. 4, lines 31-46). The removable adhesive is in the form of a lubricant, which is a water soluble polymer

Art Unit: 1772

(Col. 5, lines 30-45). The adhesive layer helps produce smooth-walled drill holes, i.e., burr free holes (Col. 5, lines 37-40). The adhesive layer adheres to substrates in solid form (Col. 3, lines 55-62) and transfers to the drill bit at higher temperatures – i.e., the removable adhesive melts at operating conditions to provide lubrication for the drill bit (Col. 5, line 25 to Col. 6, line 35).

The removable adhesive has a melting temperature of 60-65°F. Thus, it is implicit that the entire structure operates at temperature conditions within this range or above to facilitate melting of the adhesive and subsequent lubrication of the drill bit.

Hatch et al. further teach the use of entry and exit materials positioned on opposing sides of the stack of sheets (Fig. 3, #s 34 and 36). The entry and exit material for the sheets is typically some type of paper base or thin metal sheet such as aluminum (Col. 6, lines 54-56). Although Hatch et al. teach the use of an entry and exit material layer, Hatch et al. fail to teach the use of a burr preventing layer/ foil layer combination as claimed by the Applicant.

Weinreich, however, teach the use of a multilayered entry/exit board comprising a paper board laminate impregnated with a lubricant and aluminum foil layer combination (see Fig. 1). The multilayered entry/exit board is taught by Weinreich for the purpose of resisting burr-formation during drilling (Col. 2, lines 21-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hatch et al. and Weinreich since each of the aforementioned references are analogous insofar as being directed at entry/exit substrates for improving the drilling of stacked metal substrates.

Art Unit: 1772

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to have modified Hatch et al. to include a multilayered entry/exit board as taught by Weinreich in order to resist burr-formation during drilling.

With regards to the claim 17 limitation that there exists a plurality of stacks with intermediate burr-preventing layers, although Hatch et al. and Weinreich both fail to explicitly teach a multi-stack formation, modifying the aforementioned art to include a plurality of stacks would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 70. Here, the essential working parts of the invention are taught by Hatch et al. and Weinreich and one of ordinary skill in the art need only duplicate the base stack formation to be in accordance with the Applicant's claimed invention. Furthermore, the outermost aluminum layer in a stack as taught by Hatch et al. can serve as an intermediate layer as claimed by the applicant when in multiple stack formation.

4. Claims 6 – 9, 12, 13 and 34 – 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatch et al. ('370) in view of Weinreich ('671) as applied to claims 2 – 5, 10, 17, 32, 33, 40 and 41 above, and further in view of Frater (USPN 6,355,360).

Hatch et al. and Weinreich teach a structure as detailed above. The aforementioned prior art is silent with regards to the use of a three stainless steel plates on each side of the stack of

Art Unit: 1772

metal substrates as well as a blotter pad within the three stainless steel plates. It is notoriously well known in the art, however, to provide at least three stainless plates in combination with a foil layer in the production of printed circuit boards as evidenced by Frater (Col. 2, lines 53-64). These steel plates implicitly comprise pressure heads wherein a compressive force acts upon the entire substrate. Frater teaches that it is generally well known in the art to use multiple steel plates to prevent and minimize scrap and rework due to image transfer and surface quality problems (Col. 2, lines 53-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicants invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hatch et al., Weinreich, and Frater, since each of the aforementioned references are analogous insofar as being directed to improving the drilling operation in stacked metal formations.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to have modified Hatch et al. and Weinreich to include a three layered stainless steel configuration on each side of the foil layer lying adjacent the top and bottom of the stack of sheets as taught by Frater in order to prevent and minimize scrap and rework due to image transfer and surface quality problems. It further would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a paper (blotter) substrate between one of the steel plates since it is notoriously well known in the art to provide paper substrates in order to facilitate even application of pressure between opposing plates.

Art Unit: 1772

5. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatch et al. ('370) in view of Weinreich ('671) as applied to claims 2 – 5, 10, 17, 32, 33, 40 and 41 above, and further in view of Block (USPN 4,269,549).

Hatch et al. and Weinreich teach a structure as detailed above. Each of the aforementioned references detail the use of an aluminum foil layer but fail to teach the use of a copper foil layer other than Hatch et al.'s disclosure of stacked copper substrates. It is notoriously well known in the art, however, that although aluminum is generally a preferred foil material, functionally equivalent foil materials including copper, magnesium, and steel may also be used as the foil sheets in entry/exit board formations as evidenced by Block (Col. 2, lines 5-11). Therefore, absent demonstration of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to have substituted the aluminum foil layer in both Hatch et al. and Weinreich with a functionally equivalent copper layer as taught by Block depending on the desired end product.

6. Claims 38, 39 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatch et al. ('370) in view of Weinreich ('671) as applied to claims 2 – 5, 10, 17, 32, 33, 40 and 41 above, and further in view of Sinclair et al. (USPN 5,834,582).

Hatch et al. and Weinreich teach a structure as detailed above. Each of the aforementioned references detail the use of a removable adhesive material but fail to teach that the adhesive is a liquid while adhesively coupling the successive sheets to each other and the

Art Unit: 1772

removable adhesive consisting of a material selected from the group consisting of fructose and sucrose. It is notoriously well known in the art that an adhesive material made with sucrose material is removable and may be applied as a liquid as evidenced Sinclair et al. (Col. 24, lines 15 – 15; Col. 55, lines 4 – 4). Therefore, absent demonstration of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to have substituted the solid lubricant adhesive material in the modified Hatch et al. with a adhesive made from a sucrose material as taught by Sinclair et al. in order to have an strong bond between disparate materials (Col. 24, lines 34 – 36).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed June 29, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that the prior art of record fails to disclose the adhesive being in direct mechanical contact with the successive sheets in each pair since Hatch teaches a lubricating sheet, while Hatch does disclose a lubricating sheet, Hatch also discloses a second embodiment of the lubricating material where a hardener is mixed with the lubricant material forming a film that is supported by a carrier sheet before being transferred to another surface (Column 5, lines 30 – 40).

Art Unit: 1772

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Nordmeyer whose telephone number is (571) 272-1496. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 7:00-4:30 & alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y. Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patricia L. Nordmeyer
Examiner
Art Unit 1772

pln
pln


HAROLD PYON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
1772

8/19/05